

NAUFRP Executive Committee Minutes
October 2, 2018
Portland, OR

Executive Committee Attendees: Keith Belli, President (Clemson University); Jim Allen, Past President (Northern Arizona University); David Newman, President-Elect (SUNY-ESF); Katy Kavanagh, Secretary-Treasurer (Oregon State University); John Hayes, BAC Representative (Colorado State University); Mike Messina, Northeast Regional Chair (Pennsylvania State University); Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Auburn University); Terry Sharik, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University); Red Baker, Research Chair (University of Florida); Dale Greene, Southern Regional Chair (University of Georgia); Jeff Stringer, Extension Chair (University of Kentucky); Linda Nagel, Western Regional Chair (Colorado State University); Bob Wagner, At-Large Member (Purdue University); Kamran Abdollahi, Diversity Chair (Southern University); Stephen Shaler, International Chair (University of Maine); Mary Watzin, At-Large Member and Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Communications (North Carolina State University); Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel; Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison

NAUFRP Members: Adrian Leighton (Salish Kootenai College), Hans Williams (Stephen F. Austin State University), Allen Rutherford (Louisiana State University), Dan Brown (University of Washington)

Guests: Buck Vandersteen, CARET Liaison for NAUFRP (Executive Director, Louisiana Forestry Association), Daniel Cassidy, National Program Leader (NPL) for Forest Research, National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA); Eric Norland, NPL for Forest Resource Management, NIFA; Randi Johnson, Director, Division of Global Climate Change, NIFA; Ali Mohamad, Director, Division of Environmental Systems, NIFA; Rich Guldin, Senior Fellow, Society of American Foresters

March 5-6, 2018 Executive Committee minutes: The draft minutes from the March meeting had been previously sent out and posted on the website and edits provided to Terri incorporated. A motion was made by Steve Shalor to accept the minutes; a second was made by Jim Allen. There was no further discussion. The minutes were accepted unanimously.

President's Report, Keith Belli: Keith noted the McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) Strategic Communications Plan that Mary will discuss later. We will also hear about a National Forest Research Summit from Michael Goergen and Rich Guldin. Collaborators on that are meant to be NAUFRP, Society of American Foresters (SAF), US Forest Service and the U.S. Endowment for Forests and Communities. This is an outgrowth of last year's Blue Ribbon Commission Report on Forest Products Research & Development in the 21st Century. NIFA has Listening Sessions coming up (see <https://nifa.usda.gov/nifalistsens>). Last year we got the word out via the listserve encouraging NAUFRP members to attend sessions or submit written comments. The results were good. Forest health and ecosystem services (our issues) were in the top 10. Keith wants this to happen again this year. He will send a message to the listserve. This is an opportunity to

get our message about Forest Health out. There may be other issues; NAUFRP participation is key. Eric said they were glad to see all the forestry responses but would like to recommend using your own words (vs. copying and pasting). Ali said the numbers count. Keith affirmed this is about getting attention for our issues and suggested getting faculty to submit comments. Terri will resend this information to the listserv. Dale urged spending time with federal relations people on campus. UGA is hosting a Senate staff tour. Auburn hosts a similar event.

Treasurer's Report, Katy Kavanagh: Katy discussed the final report on the 2017 budget year at the March Executive Committee meeting; she plans to provide more detail to the General Assembly tomorrow. She reviewed the status of 2018 dues income. Discussion proceeded to the 2019 proposed budget. (Terri stepped out.) The Executive Committee recommended raising Terri's compensation to \$31,000 annually – an approximate nine percent increase. It has been several years since she was provided a raise. This group will recommend the proposed 2019 budget presented with this change to be voted on by the General Assembly tomorrow.

Terry asked about a one-pager that lists NAUFRP's unique attributes that will separate us out from the Association of Public Land Grant Universities (APLU) and other similar organizations. Terry thinks it would be of value to expand the national committees to incorporate regional chairs/people as was once done. John says we have been discussing this for a while and perhaps it's time to empower the chairs to do this. Keith says it was a good model and asked the regional chairs to identify people for this purpose. Mary believes it would be good to do more to get faculty interested in NAUFRP via the General Assembly -- make it worthwhile for them. Randy said that could help to develop future NAUFRP leadership. We've kept people involved through At-Large positions but they could be involved through the committees. Send names of potential committee members to Terri before March. Jim clarified that we are talking about national chairs to lead and regional chairs to recruit.

Eric Norland discussed the issue of unspent McStennis funds by institutions – NAUFRP institutions are returning too much and the funds returned go to the US Treasury. Several emails have gone out on this issue. NIFA is not exactly sure where they stand at the moment; they/institutions have 90 days from the end of the fiscal year (September 30th) to turn in their final financial report. The designated ATR at each institution is the person NIFA holds responsible for McStennis funds. One-half of the ATRs are Agricultural Experiment Station directors. Personally, Eric would like to see an institution that has returned any of their McStennis allocation reduced by that amount the next year. Keith asked that NIFA provide details at the March 2019 meeting. Mary said an issue is the ability of an institution to deficit spend; this may be a topic for the ATR meeting. Ali Mohamad says there are a group of schools who are habitual offenders. Over \$200,000 was turned back in last year. Hatch has the same problem. Overall, the agency at one time turned back in \$100 million. The FY18 McStennis allocation (3rd and 4th quarter funds) should be out shortly.

Dave Lewis, President, Terry Baker, CEO and John Barnwell, Policy Director, Dick Brinker, Board Member, Society of American Foresters (SAF): Dave Lewis introduced Terry Baker as the new CEO who came on board several weeks ago. Jim Allen served on the search committee. The SAF leadership knows they are running out of time per demographics and

retaining/recruiting younger members. (PowerPoint). They are beginning with a pledge of transparency. SAF financial information is now on their website. They are moving towards a balanced budget. They have passed and begun implementing a diversity and inclusion policy. There is agreement on a revised policy for investment funds. And they have begun addressing issues at the state society level. Earlier this year they re-established the Leadership Advisory Group. They have developed/deployed a 'Forester Inventory Team'. Jeff asked what they are using as a definition of 'forester'? They are looking at streams of non-dues revenue. And finally, they are focused on the following five key pillars: 1) Grow membership (numbers, diversity, generational) 2) establish financial security 3) increase tangible value of membership (elevate professional status of forestry) 4) promote sound forest science and policy. Jeff said they have to get faculty to recognize SAF; they are the first to engage students with SAF. Adrian said it would be very helpful for SAF to reach out to his students; the nearest SAF chapter is 60 miles away. Dave Lewis discussed requiring the SAF Certified Forester Exam as part of the SAF Accreditation of forestry programs. David asked if SAF is abandoning the Natural Resource Management Accreditation? SAF responded that they are not. Keith asked why SAF didn't poll us versus coming to us after the fact and asking for help? We would have appreciated being involved at the beginning of the process. Dick Brinker said they are here today to discuss and get ideas, not force anything. They are early in the process; the aim is to elevate the forestry profession. Keith reaffirmed NAUFRP is committed to working with SAF on these issues.

Washington Report, Randy Nuckolls, General Counsel: There is an increase for McStennis in the FY19 House and Senate appropriations bills; they are at \$36 million, up from \$33.9 million in FY18. RREA funding is flat. Current year funding for AFRI is \$400 million: the House would increase it to \$415 and Senate to \$405. Hatch is also up. The Coop Research Units were zeroed out by the Administration; it is flat in the Senate and up a little in the House at \$19 million. The Joint Fire Science Program (JFSP) was also zeroed out by the Administration. A letter was circulated to Congress in support of the JFSP program's funding and signed by many faculty. Congress has reinstated some of the funding. APLU has become active on behalf of the program and have developed a plan for next year to build support. The Farm Bill is being conferenced now. McStennis has permanent authority so there are no impacts there. However, as of October 1st, mandatory programs like the NIFA biomass programs, have no authority and cannot spend money. This affects 39 programs. The major issue of contention between the House and Senate is SNAP (Food Stamps) work requirements that the House is seeking. Randy addressed the Administration's proposal to move NIFA and ERS outside of the Washington, DC area. There is a comment period on this through October 14th. Several states are expected to make proposals. APLU and others have formed a coalition to ardently oppose the moves. The Department of Interior may also be considering similar moves for BLM, USGS and the FWS. Randy talked about the upcoming mid-term elections. Adrian asked what happens if the Farm Bill is not passed by the end of the year. Randy said the current bills die and there will be a new Congress and new bills introduced although they may be the same ones that are currently being considered if the houses do not turn over. McStennis has permanent authority so is not affected -- most research programs are permanently authorized. Adrian said that the 1994 tribal colleges would be eligible for McStennis funds under the Farm Bill proposals being considered, meaning likely, two schools in MT and MN would become eligible. John Hayes asked if the NIFA move

is definite? Randy noted USDA Secretary Perdue's letter released last week responded to Congressional questions and concerns. Some of those were addressed, others were not. Right now they are moving forward with the move. After they get proposals in USDA can do more analysis and determine what the costs-benefits might be. John asked if NAUFRP can or should be doing something more? Randy said we signed a letter circulated by APLU. Things have been delayed a month. Randy thinks we should determine a NAUFRP response after the bids are in. Eric said NIFA is moving ahead as if they are moving. There are other issues such as how programs will operate in a transition, especially since many NIFA employees say they will refuse to move. Some key Congressional members are opposed but others will have their state submitting proposals and likely be supportive. Mary agrees NAUFRP should wait till the proposals are in to determine a response. Randy says it will not go to a university because that would be a conflict of interest, but will likely get to where there is a strong land grant program.

Research Committee, Red Baker: Red reported on the meetings with NIFA staff that were held in conjunction with the Executive Committee meeting last March; at least half a dozen of us participated. He had planned a summer meeting but that did not happen. Red would like feedback on other agencies that would be good to visit or have meet with the Executive Committee. In the past we have met with the Department of Energy and National Science Foundation. Ali Mohamed suggested meeting with staff at the USDA Rural Development Administration. Additional Research Committee members are going to be Bob Wagner, Katy and Scott Merkel (Associate Research Dean, University of Georgia).

Policy Committee, Janaki Alavalpati: Janaki provided a written report. NAUFRP has been very active in the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition (FIFB). We are the only organization focused on research. We have also been a part of the Forest Climate Working Group since its inception and a signer of its founding principles. An example of how we collaborate on policy is a May 18th letter NAUFRP co-signed to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees supporting increased funding for US Forest Service Research and Development programs. Randy noted that APLU's Board of Natural Resources (BNR) is not as active as the Board of Agriculture. And he emphasized again that in the FIFB Coalition, NAUFRP is the only voice speaking for research. The Policy Chair role is crucial. Janaki is going to be stepping down. We need to build out regional representatives.

Diversity Committee, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran provided a written report. There are two meetings to note and to be posted on the NAUFRP webpage. These are the Minority in Agriculture and Natural Resources (MANRRS) April 3-6, 2019 in Overland Park, KS and the 1890 ARD Research Symposium March 29-April 3, 2019 in Jacksonville, FL. Kamran will be attending the ARD meeting. He has been involved in developing the SAF Diversity and Inclusion Policy as well as other SAF diversity actions. John Hayes says we have been working with SAF and although our interests overlap, there are pieces that fall outside of our shared interests. For example, the Logic Model which we invested years in yet nothing came of it. The question is how many eggs should we put in the SAF basket? This is not meant to be a criticism just a concern that if we delegate too much to SAF our interests may not be achieved. Terry thinks we need to work together with SAF. Keith believes this is a system: we gain the most by

figuring out how each of our organizations can work most effectively, for our parts, on diversity. John says Colorado State is moving a proposal forward. Keith believes we need to do a better job sharing information -- maybe develop a clearing house for diversity efforts/ activities for the NAUFRP webpage. Such information should be funneled to Kamran and shared.

International Committee, Steve Shaler: Steve provided a written report. He sent a survey to the NAUFRP listserv asking for information to better understand international opportunities provided to students. There were some really good responses which are synthesized in his report. Steve also provided some highlights. The intended audience for this feedback is us. The next IUFRO World Forestry Congress (WFC) meets in Sweden July 8-13 in 2024. Steve noted that Tom DeLuca (University of Montana) is a member of the committee.

Extension Committee, Jeff Stringer: As the new Chair Jeff wants to get better engaged and build a committee. An issue he would like to explore is RREA – is there a formal link between McStennis and RREA, if not, why? When he has a committee he will put together prospective plan for working on this. North Carolina State has talked about linkages between RREA and McStennis We can do more with RREA extension around McStennis research. UKY has tried to show how McStennis benefits society. Eric Norland said theoretically, \$300,000 in NIFA National Focus Funds might be available to try and do something around this.

Education Committee, Terry Sharik: Terry provided a written report. He touched on the Education Clearing house on the NAUFRP website and his work to merge the data he has collected from NAUFRP institutions on enrollments with FAEIS data collection. At the March Executive Committee meeting Lloyd Ireland proposed an ethics survey to work with NAUFRP on. Terry understands that NAUFRP is not going to run this but will help where feasible. It will be a web-based survey. Keith affirmed NAUFRP is interested in collaborating and helping. Lastly, Terry is interested in seeing the 2011 NAUFRP Undergraduate Education Strategy Plan updated. Keith recommended the new Education Chair (tbd) work with Terry on what to do on this. David recognized Terry for all his many years of service to NAUFRP.

National Research Summit, Rich Guldin (Senior Fellow, SAF) and Michael Goergen (US Endowment for Forestry and Communities via conference call): Rich distributed a 2-page handout. He served as the principle writer on the Blue Ribbon Commission report and wishes we were further along with the recommendation to convene a national research summit. The Forest Service has provided a grant to SAF and the US Endowment will also contribute funding. A NIFA grant has been applied for and they are waiting to hear back on it. There was a question about total amount of funding sought for Summit? Grant funds are intended to cover travel, meeting costs and report writing. The Endowment is committed to making it happen. The FS grant is for \$15,000. They plan on 40 participants. Rich said the next steps are 1) identify the 40 people to invite 2) summarize what the current research investment is (Rich could not get good numbers for university forestry research for the Blue Ribbon Commission but believed it was approximately \$125 million) 3) improve information on investments from related forest products research (i.e. forest-based pharmaceuticals). Terry suggested the Forest Products Society should be involved. Rich was asked what happens after you have determined a Vision and Direction? Rich says a new set of collaborators emerges and enables research to move forward with better

partnerships. Keith comments on the amount of resources going towards the research enterprise from universities and suggests they look at the McStennis matching (non-federal) dollars – this information is fed to NIFA annually. Michael was asked how does NAUFRP get involved with putting the Summit together? Michael said to appoint NAUFRP representatives and identify grand challenges. Bob Wagner volunteered to work on this. Bob says we have not looked at capacity; that needs to be part of this. And more customers/clients like the State Foresters and forest products industry need to be involved. Katy suggests 1) looking at state programs as models and 2) would like to hear from those who are going to be implementing the outcomes (i.e. people coming out of grad school). Eric says other countries have different models; Canada is a good one to look at. It would be good to hear about those. Rich agrees with Eric and said the Blue Ribbon Commission did look at different models like DOMCAR (??), Finland and the European Forestry Institute. Keith believes the most important goal that the handout lists is #3 -- coordinating a continuous system because we are not going to be able to do this every 5 years. Rich believes a FRAC-like organization will be needed and referred to the National Research Council capacity study led by Fred Cabbage in 2002. He asked who will be the point of contact for NAUFRP? Keith said Red Baker would be. Other NAUFRP representatives will be Kamran, Bob, Adrian and David. Randy noted industry used to have a robust research committee that used to go to the Hill. Tim White worked with NAFO to articulate their member research needs. This committee needs to think about how to engage stakeholders/clients. David noted the Blue Ribbon Commission focused heavily on forest products. Rich said SAF's intent is broader. Keith plans to ask the General Assembly attendees tomorrow to indicate their interest in being involved with the Summit and pass those names to Rich and Michael.

BAC/BNR, John Hayes: John participates in monthly conference calls of the APLU Budget Advocacy Committee to discuss different issues. The primary subject for the APLU Board of Natural Resources is the Forest Health Initiatives (FHI). A white paper has been developed focused on forest health impacts broadly (water, communities,...) It has a structure and format: there are twelve sections with lead authors identified. Almost all the teams have been populated. John believes they have a good structure for moving forward. The idea is to have an initial draft by late October. There will be an overview and an effort to identify where federal funding investments will help move actions forward. Red has been working to get regional examples but has had trouble finding information they are comfortable with pertaining to the status of the nation's forest health. He said we have specifics at the regional levels but it is very difficult to blow these up to a national level. He has also recently learned about a US-Canada Forest Health Summit and perhaps some of the impacts in the US will be highlighted and useful to our effort. John says 35-38 people are involved and he feels overall they have a good start; he is optimistic there will be a draft for the next meeting. APLU asked us to do this. John hopes they will stand behind us in terms of funding support. USDA Under Secretary Jim Hubbard and Linda have been talking about forest health challenges. Jim has reached out to us as USDA Secretary Perdue is moving to increase commodity production on national forests. Jim is sincerely interested in working with us. He arrives in Portland tomorrow and plans to meet with a small group of us. Keith asked who is interested in participating. Dave, Dale, Mary, John Bob, Allen, Kamran, Adrian, Katy, Janaki, Steve and Keith indicated they would like to.

Dale Greene, Southern Regional Chair Report: (*Terri out for some of this*) Bill Hubbard is going to be moving to Maryland Extension in January. The Southern Region is no longer planning to fund the regional extension consortium. A new chair needs to be identified to replace Dale.

Linda Nagel, Western Regional Chair Report: Western NAUFRP held a summer meeting at Northern Arizona University with a one day field tour. Their business meeting focused on diversity and inclusion (D&I) issues which brought to light resources that might be available. There was consensus for NAUFRP to focus more on D&I. They looked at the Southern Region's Survey and decided to rely on FAEIS for their data. They also began discussing fire in context of climate change, forest resilience and changing demographics.

Mike Messina, Northeast Regional Report: The Northeast region encompasses twelve states in but only about six are active with NAUFRP (ESF, NH, VT, ME, WV, Penn). This year they decided to meet in conjunction with the National Council of Forestry Association Executives (NCFAE) in Portland, ME in July for their annual meeting. Mike spoke to the group. He found they were a very interesting and he recommends having a local NAUFRP representative attend their future meetings. The Northeast sent back McStennis stories (about 10).

Randy challenges the regional groups to do something different with their meetings: invite different speakers, include faculty and/or regional advisors/stakeholders.

McStennis Communications Strategy, Mary Watzin: Mary said we left the March meeting with the idea to work with our institutions' communications people but that didn't come together. Instead, she has worked with her own communications person and wants to preview a PowerPoint she would like to present to the General Assembly tomorrow if this group likes it. She displayed an example (PPT) one pager for the 'North Carolina Tree Improvement Program - McStennis: Forest Innovations Start Here'. Important are the key messages and forest sector; Mary wants to leverage other partners. John comments that he has no objections to the wording but feels that McStennis is focused on a commodity here. Randy said this projects the benefits of forests for public problem solving. Dale thinks this is outstanding effort – the template is great and can be used for water, wildlife habitat and more. Keith feels we need to make an effort to understand what the general public associates with certain forestry words -- don't assume our words mean same thing to the public (example 'landscape') The research is there; that's why we need professional communicators. The template has several inherent parts to it: collaborators, a federal program, impacts, one page. Mary estimates the overall cost of this would be \$50,000; her communications person Sarah could manage it and Mary oversees. Mary is not sure this group is comfortable. Keith thinks they are. Dale is willing to contribute; he needs these. Georgia could do 6-12 of these. Adrian suggests the template could be used to profile alumni (example, 2nd Native American to achieve a PhD is now working at BLM). All stories are local but have a national impact as well. Randy asked Daniel Cassidy whether NIFA has impact statements? Daniel says they have been talking about this. Each school can take four percent administration of their McStennis allocation to use for something like this but NIFA can no longer do something like this by grant (the only option would be through a conference grant). John asked Mary whether this would be \$50,000 a year? She is not sure; we would be creating a network and template. Eric said NAUFRP can create its own McStennis logo (NIFA has no

discretionary funding for this). Mary is going to report to the General Assembly. Randy says Mary can say the Executive Committee has endorsed the tactics and pursuit of funding options and is to bring a template back to the March meeting. Mary emphasized that key to the template is the McStennis tagline and consistency in font and style. Keith said we will ask our institutions to vet the template and provide feedback to Mary by the end of the year. In January she will send the final template out for us to plug in the appropriate information for the March meeting. Bob says when we google McStennis we should hit all of our institutions' webpages with this kind of branding. Keith says we want to get people thinking and we will send instructions, details and the template.

Buck Vandersteen, CARET Liaison: CARET will have an Executive Committee meeting in New Orleans in November. He thanked Mike and Steve for participating in the NCFAE annual meeting. That will occur in Washington State next year.

Randy urged the regional chairs to think about inviting Member of Congress or their staff to their meetings.

USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture: Randi Johnson reported the 2019 RFA will be out soon and she encouraged carefully reading the agency's Budget Explanatory Notes, especially for AFRI. In the name of consolidation for efficiency all USDA employees will get new email addresses. The new NIFA Director is Scott Angle. He was dean at the University of Georgia School of Agriculture and has been very involved in APLU, BAC and CLP. Eric Norland noted the last ATR meeting was four years ago. They are planning the next one on March 7, 2019 the same week the NAUFRP Executive Committee and CARET will meet in DC, hopefully in the newly developed DC Wharf area. The Planning Committee includes three NAUFRP representatives: David Newman, Mary Watzin, Sue Blodgett (Iowa State University). They have had one call. The target audience are the ATRs. Eric reported that they (Eric, Daniel, Ali) are recommending the allowable McStennis carryover be changed to 50 percent. This is an agency-wide recommendation. Randy noted that it was after the last ATR meeting that McStennis carryover was changed from 10 to 100 percent. Eric was asked if funds don't get out to the institutions until the 3rd or 4th quarter, what then? Eric said a request can be made to carryover more. The ATR meeting will not be limited to ATRs; they will be encouraged to bring their program administrators and NAUFRP representatives. In FY2020, NIFA will begin to ask for a program budget. Steve asked if this will be university wide? Keith urged them to include the word "forecast". This is really not new but being stressed because of a recent audit. Eric said that every five years they write to the Governor in each state asking which institution is to get McStennis funds and if more than one, what percentage. This will be done in 2020 in consultation with NAUFRP with copies of all correspondence going to the institutions. A new NIFA Manual should be out by March covering all programs and will only be 199 pages.

Keith reviewed the nomination process for NAUFRP officers. Two nominations are elected every two years; all other positions are appointed by the President. This is specified in the By-Laws. Katy has agreed to be nominated as Treasurer again and Janaki as President-Elect. Current appointments end with the calendar year and new officers begin on January 1st. New Policy and Education Chairs will need to be appointed. Currently we have an Ad Hoc

Communications Chair. We may want to consider making this a standing committee chair which would require a change in the By-Laws. John noted that our structure tends to make us an inside group. If we want to send a message and recruit involvement more broadly then the process of nominating helps create that environment. Dale shares John's concerns. Keith agrees and believes the election process should be highlighted in the agendas – get it out in front to let people know. We have never really explained the process before to the general audience/assembly. We want to encourage Associate Deans and Department heads to participate. Randy notes that advance 20-day notice is needed to amend the By-Laws. Anyone can recommend a By-Law change but it would ultimately come before the General Assembly. A Good Best Practice is to consistently communicate to the General Assembly that there is a nominating committee if you want to be nominated. Elections are one vote per institution.

Adrian asked if the Farm Bill makes 1994 institutions eligible for McStennis would a 1994 representative be added to the Executive Committee and if so, how would this be done? This would need to come to the Secretary-Treasurer 30 days before General Assembly meeting who would need to circulate such proposal 20 days before the General Assembly meets.

Keith urges inviting forestry/natural resource faculty going through LEAD21 to the DC Executive Committee in March. This is how he first came to know about NAUFRP. Randy added, if you can't make an Executive Committee or General Assembly meeting, ask someone from your institution or region to represent you. Bring these folks to the meetings.

Adjourned.

*Minutes Approved
March 5, 2019
Washington, D.C.*